



# Eco Awareness Society Newsletter

**“It is error alone which needs the support of government. Truth can stand by itself.”**

Thomas Jefferson

June 2010  
No. 10



**Katie MacLean with turkey flock  
Bailey's Brook, Nova Scotia**

## Wind Can't Replace Nuclear [or Anything Else]

**Ontario** – Gideon Forman's letter urging us “to phase out conventional power and switch over to renewables, including wind turbines”, demonstrates [a] lack of technical understanding. **It is not possible to replace coal or nuclear plants with wind turbines.** They average only about 27% output in Ontario. Without base load plants such as nuclear, hydro, coal or gas we would all be without power the majority of the time no matter how many wind turbines or solar plants were built. The wind simply doesn't blow all the time at the required velocity and the sun often doesn't shine. **Ontario is now constructing natural gas plants to back up renewables and it is those gas plants that will replace coal, not wind or solar.**

Moreover, the Suzuki Foundation cautions: Unlike coal, “emissions of fine particulates from natural gas-fired power plants are dangerously small. They have the greatest impact on human health” because they “end up deep in the lungs... Many studies have found no safe limit for exposure”.

The Ontario Power Authority[s] (OPA) plan of October, 2007 concluded that **adding any substantial amount of wind power to Ontario's grid [as an alternative to hydro] “would result in higher greenhouse gas emissions [CO2] because of the need to install back-up gas plants”.**

...

So what will the wind turbines and solar panels accomplish? Our government has contracted to pay 4 to 20 times above market rates for “green” electricity. Ratepayers will also pay for the gas to back up the wind... When electricity prices increase sharply, our province becomes less competitive. Manufacturers relocate. Unemployment causes the tax base to shrink.

The OPA report noted that it was more cost effective to develop hydro generation north of Sudbury rather than developing additional wind generation in southern or northern

Ontario. Instead of listening to his expert advisors, former Energy Minister George Smitherman took control of the OPA and demanded inflated compensation for renewable electricity producers. He then abruptly resigned.

Keith Stelling, The Sun Times, April 17, 2010

## Ontario Municipality Passes Bylaw to Control Wind Turbines

**Ontario** – Arran-Elderslie has passed a bylaw to control wind turbine development based on health concerns and the [Canadian] Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Council unanimously approved final reading to the bylaw...

Elderslie ward Coun. Mark Davis and the municipality's former clerk-administrator Joan Albright worked on the bylaw, which calls for “the protection of life, liberty and security of person” under Section 7 of the Charter, claiming wind turbines cause serious health effects.

**“We owe it to our people to maintain their health and well-being,” Davis said when he first presented the bylaw to council two weeks ago...** Tara ward Coun. Paul Eagleson said... “when the government brought in the Green Energy Act they stripped us (local municipalities) of our rights”...

Davis later admitted wind energy projects “could become an issue” in this fall's municipal election campaign. “If I decide to run and if I lose on this one issue, that will be OK because I'll go down knowing I did what is best for the total municipality...the negative effect of these things on this municipality is huge...”

Arran-Elderslie will circulate the bylaw to all municipalities in Ontario seeking support. Grey County Council passed a motion last week to direct county staff to investigate preparing a similar wind turbine control bylaw...

(Excerpt from “Arran-Elderslie Passes Bylaw to Control Wind Turbines”,

Mary Golem, The Sun Times, May 10, 2010)

~~~

“A single 555-megawatt gas-fired power plant in California generates more electricity in a year than do all 13,000 of the state's wind turbines. The gas-fired plant sits atop a mere 15 acres. The 300-foot-tall windmills impact over a hundred thousand acres to provide expensive, intermittent, insufficient energy.”

L.M. Schwartz

~~~

## Coercive Tactics Used to Push Wind Power

**Minnesota** - We all have opinions based on a certain level of information or personal experience. When we do not have enough personal knowledge or experience, we trust in the opinions of others that we respect or deem more knowledgeable. This is the foundation of marketing.

When it comes to the kind of cars we drive or the kind of cola we drink, being persuaded by public relations firms is harmless enough... When it comes to public policy, however, the art of persuasion can become downright dangerous. You see, it is the job of a public relations firm to lead us into an opinion before we have a complete understanding of the issues. Once an opinion is formed, it can easily be reinforced by selectively introducing "facts" to lead us into believing that we are informed.

When we begin to learn more, the new facts that we learn often disagree with our opinions. This leads to cognitive dissonance, the foundation of [an] "emotional issue." Cognitive dissonance is the public relations firm's best friend because it often manifests itself as anger and distrust, which only serve to marginalize opposing viewpoints. Re-examining deeply held beliefs is uncomfortable. Rather than risking the humiliation of being "wrong," it is much easier to distance ourselves from the information that contradicts our opinions.

In an "emotional issue," each side believes that the other is uninformed or misinformed... Each side then attempts to gain support by stating the "facts" to persuade those that might not have formed an opinion yet. The cycle is self-reinforcing and the issue is never resolved. Unresolved issues lead to inaction by public officials and regulating authorities. This inaction allows big business to operate unimpeded, unregulated, and with a somewhat conflicted blessing from government in a sort of de facto corporatism, or fascism.

... This is what we are experiencing right now in the Goodhue [Minnesota] area. Before the general public knew about the wind project... several large landowners had been approached in secret, and significant acreage was placed under easement. Next, members of the community were invited to "invest" in the project in increments of \$10,000, with the caveat that it was possible for the investment to disappear in its entirety if the project does not go through...

**In our experience, the "citizens, businesses and stakeholder groups" that have been mobilized to target local government are not the people who will be living in the footprint of the proposed project.** Our neighbours have been led to believe that anyone who does not want to endure a life within the trajectory range of ice throw or noises well above the established threshold for sleep disturbance are the reason that their "investment" will fail.

Granted, in a partially regulated market, big business has no motivation to protect the public, as government or the land-

owners will be there to pick up the liability when someone incurs damages, but holding money from the community hostage in exchange for public support is just dirty.

The key to proper turbine placement is property rights. No one should have the right to tell you what you must or cannot do on your property as long as your neighbour's use and enjoyment of his property is not impeded. **You have no right to tell your neighbour what will not affect him; you could be wrong.**

(Excerpt from "Coercive Marketing Tactics Used to Push Wind Project",

Paul Reese, Post-Bulletin, April 28, 2010)

## Wind Mandate Increases Pollution

**Colorado** - "Cleaner air and cheaper energy" was the slogan when voters mandated wind and other renewable sources for 10 percent of the state's electric generation with Amendment 37 in 2004. Democratic legislators liked the idea so much that they upped the mandate to 20 percent in 2007 and boosted it this year to 30 percent.

**One small problem: Neither half of the slogan is true...** Will costs level off with more reliance on renewables? Not according to the Energy Information Administration, which says in the coming decade wind will cost about 75 percent more than natural gas, 50 percent more than coal, and 25 percent more than nuclear...

But pollution is a different story, right? Surely a silently whirring wind turbine is better for air quality than a plant burning fossil fuels and belching carbon. You'd think so, but you'd be wrong.

During the years 2006-2009 here in metro Denver, **forcing wind into the electric-generation mix actually resulted in higher emission levels of sulfur dioxide and nitrous oxide, the principal components of ozone and smog, as well as higher emission levels of CO<sub>2</sub>, widely feared as a greenhouse gas.** Oops.

Two obvious questions follow: How so? And says who? The "how" is a consequence of wind power's intermittent reliability (online only about a third of the time), which requires coal-fired plants to cycle on and off more frequently and burn much dirtier as a result.

The "who" is a consultancy called BENTEK Energy, based in Evergreen and nationally respected for such research as the wind study I'm citing. "How Less Became More: Wind, Power, and Unintended Consequences in the Colorado Energy Market" is BENTEK's report...

(Excerpt from "Did Wind Mandate Worsen Pollution?",

John Andrews, The Denver Post, May 16, 2010)

A hole has been found in the nudist camp wall.  
The police are looking into it.

## Liberals, NDP Revictimizing Many Families

**Ontario** – People from all corners of the province rallied in Queen’s Park on April 28<sup>th</sup> to voice their concerns about wind turbines!

...Estimates are that there were at least 700 people at the rally...People who have seen their communities ravaged by wind turbines sent blessings to the rally and they were there in spirit. Letters of support came from Quebec, the United States, Nordic and Baltic States, France, Germany, Spain, Australia and the United Kingdom.

Speakers included several conservative MPPs, Dr. McMurtry, Ian Hanna, Eric Gillespie, Michael Trebilcock, Carmen Krogh, John Laforet, municipal representatives and people who have had to cope with living near turbines...

**The motion was put forward by John Yakabuski: “I move that the Legislative Assembly of Ontario calls for a moratorium on all wind farm projects until an independent, comprehensive study of the health and environmental impacts of wind farms is completed and Premier McGuinty restores the planning authority governing them to municipalities and local boards.”**

The Conservatives continually challenged Liberal and NDP MPPs who hollowly prattled out the same old debunked and outdated arguments. MPP Helena Jaczek stated “...there is no published data that confirm the claims of adverse health effects for low frequency sounds of low pressure. In 1999-“

Norma, who had been quietly sitting in the gallery flew to her feet and spoke from the deepest place in her heart...She was strong and sure when she spoke. She told them that she was evidence that something is wrong, that this was real, that people are getting sick, that she is an RN who knows about health and symptoms and that she has been sick since the Enbridge wind turbines started up. She said that she has experience the headaches, the nausea, the sleep deprivation, that she had to give up her job; a job she dearly loved and that she was going to have to give up her home of 32 years, the home she raised her three children in.

**The Deputy Speaker asked to have Norma removed but the security person only stood nearby.**

Norma continued, asking how dare this government, a government that is supposed to protect us, deny that this is happening to us! Where is my government?...You should all be ashamed of yourselves!

Suddenly all in the public galleries were on their feet applauding and cheering! The Conservatives on the floor followed suit. The Deputy Speaker decided to clear the galleries. Some continued expressing concern by sitting quietly and refusing to leave. One person clearly voiced his disgust that the government removed our municipal voice and were now doing the same in the provincial legislature.

Another asked where the ministries were to defend the envi-

ronment, the wildlife and proper process...

**The Liberal and NDP MPPs voted to defeat the motion, denying and revictimizing many families across Ontario.**

(Excerpt from a letter written by Lorrie Gillis, Grey Highlands, which appeared in the Orangeville Citizen, May 13, 2010)



Viper's Bugloss

Viper's Bugloss, also called Blueweed can be found in fields and along roadsides in Nova Scotia, especially where limestone soils occur. It grows to a height of 30 – 90 cm and flowers June through October. This species was introduced as early as 1683 in North America. It is considered an unusual wildflower as well as an herb.

Viper's Bugloss was said to be an expellant of poisons and venom, and to cure the bites of a viper. Bugloss is from the ancient Greek for “ox-tongue,” which the leaves of this plant were thought to resemble.

It was written that “the water distilled in glasses or the roote itself taken is good against the passions and tremblings of the heart as also against swoonings, sadness and melancholy.”



A small boy swallowed some coins and was taken to a hospital. When his grandmother telephoned to ask how he was, a nurse said, “No change yet.”



Turtlehead

Turtlehead can be found along streambanks, wet thickets, damp meadows and wooded hollows and is usually in shady areas throughout Nova Scotia. This wildflower grows to a height of 30 – 90 cm and flowers July through September.

Its name derives from the clusters of white flowers which resemble the head of a turtle. It is not uncommon to find the white flowers with a pink blush.

Turtlehead is from the Snapdragon Family and is a native wildflower. Turtlehead is the primary plant that the Baltimore Checkerspot Butterfly lays its eggs on and is a popular browse plant for deer. The Abenaki people used this plant as a method of birth control.



When cannibals ate a missionary, they got a taste of religion.

### Wind Energy Isn't Free

#### **Maine - Wind energy isn't free. And, it's destructive.**

The cost of electricity in Maine will double because of Gov. Baldacci's climate change policies favouring wind energy. Despite the claims of "Wind Week" propagandists, **there is no empirical evidence that wind power will: 1. reduce the cost of electricity in Maine, 2. reduce carbon emissions, 3. make Maine's energy independent', or 4. be environmentally friendly.**

Average residential monthly electric bills could go up by \$50 to \$100 when these policies are fully implemented. The total cost of wind turbines and transmission upgrades will be \$7 billion, but produce less than 700 megawatts of electricity.

The Baldacci government rejected from the energy mix cheaper, clean hydropower available for purchase at 3.5 cents per kilowatt-hour from our Canadian neighbours. Rejected also was supporting less expensive clean energy from hydro or nuclear power in the northeast.

Debt-ridden Spain's experience shows that despite a temporary increase in construction jobs to build alternative energy, 2.2 permanent jobs were destroyed for every construction job created. **Why is our government forcing job-destroying policies on us? To reduce carbon emissions?**

Despite claims that wind power will offset fossil-fuel electricity – reducing carbon emissions – there is no empirical evidence that has occurred or will ever occur...**Real-world experience proves no emission reductions from wind power.**

The erratic nature of wind power requires gas-fired generators to run at lower efficiency levels, causing higher rates of CO2 emission, as experience in Europe has proved. Wind policies have actually increased CO2 emissions there be-

#### **cause of this intractable problem. Zero emissions reduction, for doubling electric bills?**

It is very hard to see how installing thousands of wind turbines on mountains and hundreds of them offshore will make Maine energy independent from imported oil. Maine's primary use for oil is for heating. Less than 5% of the oil comes from Saudi Arabia. We import none from Iran or Iraq. The majority of heating oil used in Maine comes from the United States, Canada and Mexico.

Heating oil represents one of the best values Mainers can buy. At \$2.79 per gallon, heating oil is 60% less expensive than heating by electricity at 15 cents per kwh. The price would have to go to \$6 per gallon - \$200 per barrel – to just reach the equivalent cost and \$400 per barrel to get to 24 cents per wind-driven kwh.

Wind power is destructive to the environment and harmful to people's health. Over 30,000 acres of Maine's mountain-top forests will be permanently clear-cut and destroyed to build industrial parks. Ironically, by killing the trees on over 30,000 acres, wind parks will lessen the amount of carbon sequestered and the manufacture and transportation of the turbines will result in no net gain in the reduction of carbon.

The wind turbines in Maine will cause over 45,000 new bird kills per year, using U.S. Fish and Wildlife estimates. Recent news stories have shown health problems from living near turbines in Mars Hill and Vinalhaven.

**Do our public servants have our best interests in mind or theirs?** Perhaps Mainers will begin to reconsider their support for the wind power industry, now that they know what it's costing them.

(Excerpt from "Answer to Energy Needs isn't Blowing in the Wind",

J. Dwight, Sun Journal, May 16, 2010)



EAS newsletter is published monthly by the Eco Awareness Society. All work is done on a volunteer basis. Membership is \$10. yearly. If you would like to become a member or for more information on EAS, please contact any of the following members:

Kristen Overmyer, president	926-2297
Eileen Mackinnon, vice president & secretary	926-2292
Faye Kinney, treasurer	926-2617
June MacDonald, director	926-2205
Susan Overmyer, media relations, editor & publisher	926-2297

The Eco Awareness Society is a non-profit organization whose mission is to uphold these principles: that "a subset of society should not be forced to bear the cost of a benefit for the larger society", that a landowner's right to full use and enjoyment of their property be upheld and not taken or hindered for public or private use or development, without just compensation, and that any policy or development with regard to the environment and landscape of Nova Scotia be shown to be effective and based on the principals of environmental sustainability and stewardship of our precious resources.\*

\*Based on the *Canadian Charter of Rights* and the *Fifth Amendment, U.S. Constitution*